

REMARKS

This Request for Reconsideration is in response to the Final Action of May 14, 2009 in which claims 31-44 were finally rejected.

I. Cited documents

The Office Action rejected pending claims 31-44 on the grounds of:

- D1) US 5,862,248 (*Salatino et al*)
- D2) US 2003/0210809 A1 (*Kim*)
- D3) US 6,327,376 B1 (*Harkin*)
- D4) US 7,251,351 (*Mathiassen*)

II. Novelty

Independent claim 31 vs. D1

Sensor arrangement claim 31 comprises the following features:

- F1) at least one sensor
- F2) at least one integrated signal processing circuit for the measurement of signals from the at least one sensor
- F3) interconnecting wiring between the at least one sensor and the integrated circuit
- F4) a substrate forming at least part of said interconnecting wiring
- F5) said substrate is further arranged to serve as a functional part of at least one said sensor
- F6) said substrate comprises means for forming a sensor together with a sensor part, wherein said substrate and said sensor part are galvanically separated, and wherein said substrate and said sensor part comprise means for transferring energy and measurement information inductively between said substrate and said sensor part

D1 (col. 7 lines 34-37) discloses that

“The sensing electrode 78 may be connected to sensing electronics 73 formed in the active layer 66 as schematically illustrated, and as would be readily appreciated by those skilled in the art.”

Also, Figures 6 and 7 illustrate wiring penetrating through layers 76, 71, 70, 68, and 67 for overtaking active layer 66 and integrated sensing electronics 73.

D1 does not disclose any substrate, which forms a part of the wiring, so, it lacks feature F4.

It is unclear what is a substrate to which the Office Action refers in D1, but there is no hint in D1 that one of planar layers (layers 76, 71, 70, 68, and 67) forms a part of the wiring and serves as a functional part of the fingerprint sensor. Thus, D1 lacks also feature F5.

In any event, D1 does not describe any substrate, which forms a part of the wiring and serves as a functional part of the sensor, that comprises means for forming a sensor together with a sensor part galvanically separated from the substrate. Moreover, D1 does not represent that the substrate, which forms a part of the wiring, which serves as a functional part of the sensor, and which comprises the means for forming the sensor together with the sensor part galvanically separated from the substrate, and the aforesaid sensor part comprise means for transferring energy and measurement information inductively between the substrate and the sensor part. Therefore, D1 lacks also feature F6.

The above-mentioned lacking features eliminate disadvantages relating to interconnecting wiring and vias through the planar substrates, which are complicated to manufacture since the wiring may be provided within a small space. Furthermore, such wiring is very sophisticated, which tends to make the sensor structure to break easily in mobile use.

According to the above, D1 does not disclose the sensor arrangement of claim 31 and D1 is inapplicable as a 35 U.S.C. § 102 reference. Withdrawal of the novelty rejection of claim 31 and its dependent claims 33-34 and 40-42 is requested.

If the novelty rejection is nonetheless to be maintained, it is requested that the Examiner clearly indicate in an Advisory Action from D1 details which “disclose” the sensor arrangement of claim 31 so that the applicants can understand the Examiner’s arguments. For example, it is now unclear which part of the fingerprint sensor of D1 the Examiner interprets to be the claimed substrate of claimed feature F4.

III. Nonobviousness

For at least some reasons as given above, the various obviousness rejections applied against claim 32 in section 6 based on D1 and D2, against claims 35, 37, 38, 43 and 44 in section 7 based on D1 and D3, against claim 36 in section 8 based on D1, D3 and D4, and against claim 39 in section 9 based on D1 and an unsupported assertion of official notice, are inapplicable and withdrawal thereof is requested. With regard to the official notice taken in sections 7 and 9, is requested that the Examiner come forward with specific references to support these assertions.

IV. Conclusion

The objections and rejections of the Office Action of May 14, 2009, having been obviated by amendment or shown to be inapplicable, withdrawal thereof is requested and passage of claims 31-44 to issue is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,



Francis J. Maguire
Attorney for the Applicant
Registration No. 31,391

FJM/mo
WARE, FRESSOLA, VAN DER SLUYS
& ADOLPHSON LLP
755 Main Street, P.O. Box 224
Monroe, Connecticut 06468
(203) 261-1234